



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,768	10/06/2000	Jeffrey Wayne McDonald	1335	1633
28004	7590	05/04/2004	EXAMINER	
SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			TRUONG, LECHI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	16

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/684,768	MCDONALD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LeChi Truong	2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12, 18-35 and 41-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12, 18-35 and 41-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>14</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12, 18-35, 41-45 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 7, 20-28, 30, 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthias et al (US. Patent 5,511,199 in view Travis et al (US. 5,422,999) and further in view of Ratner et al (US. Patent 5,889,957).
3. As to claim 1, Anthias teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a first process (a first computer program, col 2, ln 22-39), a first computer (a first computer language, col 2, ln 22-39), a destination (target object, col 3, ln 39-67, col 4, ln 1-11), a second computer (second computer language, col 2, ln 22-39), destination information / message information (a predetermined description of classes, col 2, ln 22-39/ col 3, ln 39-67, col 4, ln 1-11), a message X (object)(a generic send message function/ new object, col 2, ln 22-39/ col 3, ln 39-67, col 4, ln 1-11, the message, col 2, ln 5-15), a message (a message, col 2, ln 22-39), protocol(a first message protocol/ second message protocol, col
4. Anthias does not explicit teach an environment variable from ...a transport protocol at runtime, X as object, a pointer to a message, generating a tag Storing a tag in an outbound

message vector. However, Travis an environment variable from ...a transport protocol at runtime, X as object, a pointer to a message, generating a tag Storing a tag in an outbound message vector (et al teaches different types of services ... one computer to another computer (col 1, ln 15-27, the information object 30, an external reference vector 34/35, stores value that identify the data type of the referenced object, col 3, ln 1-67/ Fig. 2A, the pointers in the entries 76, col 5, ln 10-67).

5. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Anthias and Travis because Travis's the information object 30, an external reference vector 34/35, stores value that identify the data type of the referenced object would provide a message with may contain large amounts of data generates by other applications processed by each computer and to provide a new and improved data transport system for transferring data in digital data processing system.

6. Anthias and Travis do not teach a transport protocol at run-time, the second computer comprises a Tandem parallel processor computer system and the destination operates within a Guardian Operating environment. However, Ratner teaches a transport protocol at run-time (the run-time environment will begin a receiving process and create logical connection between the two cooperation process (the original process and the receiving process, col 7, ln 16-20/ col 6, ln 10-17/ col 2, ln 5-10), the second computer comprises a Tandem parallel processor computer system and the destination operates within a Guardian Operating environment (node 132 is in a Tandem computer and operating system 140 is running under Guardian Tandem operating system, the operating system 140 which much be also be the operating system common to both

server application/ parallel server to work on a problem in Tandem. TS/MP compatible Servers, col 3, ln 30-37, ln 40-53).

7. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Anthias, Travis and Ratner because Ratner's "the run-time environment will begin a receiving process and create logical connection between the two cooperating process" and "node 132 is in a Tandem computer and operating system 140 is running under Guardian Tandem operating system, the operating system 140 which much be also be the operating system common to both server application/ parallel server to work on a problem in Tandem. TS/MP compatible servers" would solve problems of a typical on-line transaction between a plurality of clients and one or more servers by providing messages for client and server applications with information to establish a soft of temporary dedicated connection between server and client.

8. **As to claim 2,** Anthias teaches a second process (a second object oriented program, col 2, ln 21-39).

9. **As to claim 3,** Anthias teaches a name of the second process(C++, col 4, ln 12-67).

10. **As to claim 4,** Anthias teaches process to process (a Smalltalk object and C++ object, col 5, ln 26-60/ Fig. 1).

11. **As to claim 5,7,** Ratner teaches the pathway (the client calls one the API of the TS/MP (pathway), col 8,ln 10-15).

12. **As to claim 20,** Anthias teaches a unique identifier (data identifying, col 9, ln 65-67, col 10, ln 1-7).

Art Unit: 2126

13. **As to claim 21**, Anthias teaches a rely from the second computer (first program calling ... second computer program).

14. **As to claim 22**, Anthias teaches registering a service (first program sends a message to a target object, col 2, ln 22-39).

15. **As to claim 23**, Anthias teaches receiving the message information (sending said message to said target object, col 2, ln 22-39).

16. **As to claim 24**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Anthias teaches communication software operational (computer program, col 2, ln 22-39).

17. **As to claims 25-27**, they are apparatus claims of claims 2, 3, 4; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 3, 4 above.

18. **As to claims 28, 30**, they are apparatus claims of claims 5,7; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claim 5, 7 above.

19. **As to claims 43-45**, they are apparatus claims of claims 20, 21, 22; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 20, 21, 22 above.

20. Claims 18, 19, 41, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthias et al (US. Patent 5,511,199 in view Travis et al (US. 5,422,999) in view of Ratner et al (US. Patent 5,889,957) and further in view of Frank William Grilchrist (US. Patent 6,081 832).

21. **As to claim 18, 19**, Anthias, Travis and Ratner do not teach a checking for error, an error service. However, Grilchist teaches a checking for error, an error service (the type of error, the Report Indicator class, col 25, ln 37-45).

Art Unit: 2126

22. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Anthias, Travis, Ratner and Grilchist because Grilchist's the type of error, the Report Indicator class would determine whether the message is the report of delivery or an error.

23. **As to claim 41, 42,** they are apparatus claims of claims 18, 19; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claim 18, 19 above.

24. Claims 6, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthias et al (US. Patent 5,511,199) in view Travis et al (US. 5,422,999) and in view of Ratner et al (US. Patent 5,889,957) and further in view or AD (Applicant Design Service Handbook).

25. **As to claim 6,** Anthias, Travis and Ratner do not teach a name of the pathway. However, AD teaches a name of the pathway (Pathway name, page 164,ln 22-26).

26. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of apply the teaching of Anthias, Travis and Ratner and AD because AD's pathway name would provide the capability of naming uniquely all created process, so that would not be a limitation.

27. **As to the claim 29,** it is an apparatus claim of claim 6; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 6 above.

28. Claims 8-12, 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthias et al (US. Patent 5,5, 911,199) in view Travis et al (US. 5,422,999) in in view of Ratner

et al (US. Patent 5,889,957 and further in view of John Shapley Gray (Interprocess communication in Unix).

29. **As to claim 8, 9,10, 11, 12,** Anthias, Travis and Ratner do not teach a socket, a port number of socket, Internet protocol address, address. However, John teaches a socket, a port number of socket, Internet protocol address, address (socket, a port number (section 10.4.2), address (section, 10.2.1), ICMP (section 10.2.3).

30. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Anthias, Travis, Ratner and John because John's socket, a port number, address, ICMP would make the communication between process and destination more available to use in any systems.

31. **As to claim 31-35,** they are apparatus claims of claims 9-12; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 9-12 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2126

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

April 20, 2004



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100